

Remark

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 9, 12, 29, 39, 43 and 47 have been amended. Claim 6 has been canceled. Therefore, claims 1-5 and 7-49 are now presented for examination.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because figures 3, 4 and 5 reproduced with multiple gaps and partial lines. Replacement drawings are submitted herewith.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 47 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 (c), as indefinite. These claims are amended.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection

Manning

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7-13, 15-20, 22-23, 43-44 and 47-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Manning, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0103829, ("Manning"). Manning is best summed up at paragraph 0034. It provides a technique for defining the element structure of XML documents as entries in related database tables in a database program. The table entries allow the entries to be searched. Figure 7 shows examples of the tables.

In paragraph 3.1 of the Office action of November 1, 2005, The Examiner sets forth an interpretation of Manning as showing a persistence package, persistent data, and a storage format. This interpretation does not come from the reference. However, for

purposes of expediting prosecution, Applicant will discuss the reference as if the claims applied to Manning.

In paragraph 3.2, the Examiner continues to draw the analogy in terminology between the claims and Manning as applied to "transforms". The Examiner further suggests that the values in the page table are formatted or transformed because the page table 220 values are numbers in the NUMBER column rather than text. Applicant submits that this is a table of page numbers. The values in the original document would be page numbers, just as they are page numbers in the NUMBER column. This may be compared to the text object table in which the data values are indicated as being text. The page table 220 is further illuminated by reference to Figure 5 in which there is an item 1006, identified as page number and the value is "2". "2" is the number from the document that will be added to the number field in the page table.

In paragraph 3.3, the Examiner continues that the NUMBER column shows that a value has been transformed or formatted as a number rather than as text. Again, Applicant submits that the value 1006 in the original is also a number not text.

Claim 1, for example, has been amended to further clarify the differences between the invention and the references, especially Manning.

In Claim 1, the persistence package is in a format of a software component and is transformed into a storage format that is independent of the software component that provided the data. In Manning the data is in XML, an application-independent language that is designed to be used by a wide range of different applications. It is not formatted for any particular software component. It is then converted into SQL tables, another application-independent structure.

In Claim 1, the data is provided from one of a plurality of different software components having persistent data in different formats. In Manning, the data is all in the same XML format no matter where it came from.

In Claim 1, the data is transformed without using the software component from which the persistence package is received. In Manning, different software components are not identified, but it is probable that the entire system is designed to work with the same XML formatted documents using the same software components.

Also in Claim 1, the storage format is a format that is compatible with the receiving system and with a storage device independent of the software component from which the persistent package was received. Manning does not say whether any software components are to be used but many SQL systems also handle XML.

For all of the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference. None of the other references were relied upon to show or suggest, nor do they show or suggest, the limitations described above, and accordingly the rejections based upon these other references are also respectfully traversed. The additional grounds for rejection provided for the other claims are not discussed herein, in the interests of reducing the time burden on the Examiner for this application.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 15, 2005



Gordon R. Lindén III

Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980